

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 were originally presented for examination. Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter recited therein. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for identifying the allowable subject matter.

Drawings

Drawings have been objected to for not showing the multiplexer as recited in claim 28. Claim 28 has been amended to remove the objections.

Specification

The abstract has been objected to because it exceeds 150 words. Applicants respectfully disagree. The current abstract comprises 139 words, which is within the 150 words requirement of MPEP §608.01(b). Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this objection.

Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1, 7-14, 21-25 and 28-32 have been rejected under USC 35 §103(a) over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Yanagi et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations similar to claim 3, which has been indicated by the Examiner to be allowable. Amended claim 1 is now patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 7-9 depend from amended claim 1 and are patentably distinguishable from the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 10 has been amended to recite determining if one or more estimates of the data symbol have one or more probable errors within a window of shift registers. Neither of the cited

references shows, suggests, or teaches this limitation. In contrast, Yanagi et al. measures the amplitude of the incoming signal and compares it against a predetermined threshold to determine whether to forward the errors for updating the adaptive filter (*see* col. 5, lines 50-60). Accordingly, claim 10 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 11-14 depend from amended claim 10 and are patentably distinguishable from the cited references for at least the same reasons as amended claim 10.

Claim 21 has been amended to recite a decision quality estimator for computing one or more decision quality indicators of estimates within a window and generating a decision quality indicator dependent value. Neither of the cited references shows, teaches, or suggests this limitation. Accordingly, claim 21 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 22-25 and 28 depend from amended claim 21 and are patentably distinguishable from the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 21.

Claim 29 has been amended to recite a transmission error estimation circuit for identifying probable errors in a sequence of decision quality indicators within a window. As stated herein above, Yanagi et al. does not show, suggest, or teach this limitation. Accordingly amended claim 29 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 30-32 depend from claim 29 and are patentably distinguishable from the cited references for at least the same reasons as amended claim 29.

Claims 2 and 26 have been rejected under U.S.C. 35 §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Yanagi et al. and Heppe. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 2 has been canceled thus, the rejection of claim 2 has rendered moot.

Claim 26 depends from amended claim 21, which has been distinguished from AAPA and Yanagi et al. for failing to disclose computing one or more decision quality indicators of estimates within a window. Accordingly, claim 26 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references for at least the same reasons as amended claim 21.

Applicant believes this application and the claims herein to be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have further inquiry concerning these matters, please contact the below named attorney for Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Abdul Zindani', with a horizontal line underneath.

Abdul Zindani
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,091

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5137